

APPENDIX D3

Dear Mr. Quayle.

I object to the above appropriation on a personal basis, for the following reasons.

- 1) 4,287 hectares is a considerable part of the park (approaching 40%), including some of the heaviest used areas and facilities.
- 2) The reduction in park land will have a considerable impact on recreational and public open space
- 3) Although the Labour leadership have talked of providing like facilities nearby, so that there is no nett loss of public open space, the details are vague.
- 4) Although the same Labour Members have claimed that the full extent of the appropriation was evident in the consultation I am not convinced of that and, in any case, I am not aware that any took place on Northborough Estate.
- 5) The Leader and Deputy Leader have indicated that there has been considerable discussion with Slough Estates and that some of the 'new' park/recreational space may come from SEL land sandwiched between Kennedy Park and Northborough Estate but, again, the details are not clear.
- 6) Despite being elected to represent the Haymill Ward, including Northborough Estate, the ward councillors have been excluded from all discussions with Slough Estates and developers (the same can probably be said for Britwell councillors), leaving us unable to answer any of the above or to have raised questions/made suggestions in a timely matter.
- 7) The above is critical because there is confirmed or suspected/probable contamination to all of the Slough Estates land, which is also deeply uneven and covered in weed, wild grasses or scrub. To restore this land to a level state and covered in cultivated grass that will provide the sort of surface being lost from Kennedy Park must be very costly and may risk disturbing contaminated soil.
- 8) As such, Slough Borough Council may incur significant cost defaulting to the householders of Slough, be they tenants or owner-occupiers, and the Northborough residents may be put at risk to their health.
- 9) The residents of Northborough Estate have not been asked, so far as I know, how they feel about any extension of park land towards their properties, on ground that is elevated well above Northborough Estate - in places the Slough Estates land is level with the first-floor bedrooms of Northborough Estate houses and flats.
- 10) Along with issues about how the Slough Estates land could be brought in to a condition equivalent of that currently provided by Kennedy Park without public risk through disturbing contaminated land or avoiding significant cost to Slough households, has to be considered the boundary arrangements.
- 11) It is not adequate to argue that these are after-an-appropriation planning issues - they all have to factors considered and answered to the public's satisfaction before making a decision on whether to appropriate.
- 12) It is gratuitous and flippant of the Leader of Council (Councillor Anderson) to comment in a Cabinet meeting that 'we can put a few changing rooms on the

land'. It shows how little regard he and his party have for the environmental issues or the residents of Northborough and Britwell Estates.

In summary, **and whilst wanting to see continuation of the commitment by the previous administration to replace the Wentworth Avenue flats and shops with better housing and retail**, too little is known about environmental, recreational or financial consequences of the proposed appropriation due to the exclusion by the controlling group of community and their elected representatives from engagement in or a full disclosure of all the considerations.

I, therefore, feel bound to object to the proposed appropriation before it and all associated factors have been subject to full and open scrutiny. My objections compliment the grounds for those already submitted by Britwell ward councillors.

David Munkley (Haymill Ward Councillor)